from Arizona for having this Special Order.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to sum up.

What you have heard tonight, those who have been listening, are the outlines of the scandal of our lifetime—the scandal of our lifetime that began in 2009 and proceeded forth even to revelations in the last 36 hours of Mr. Comey changing the wording in his draft from the statutory culpable mental state requirement of gross negligence to merely carelessness.

That is a huge change as he prepared his draft report on Mrs. Clinton and the misuse of her email server giving access—which we don't even know. We don't have access to that. But you take this back from the Uranium One situation, the transaction that should never have happened, the money that changed hands, and you look at the common thread throughout.

Well, oddly enough, it is Robert Mueller. Robert Mueller sits today as the investigator of the supposed collusion between the Trump administration and the Russians to influence the election.

Oddly enough, it has turned on its head. We have found out now that it is the DNC and the Hillary Clinton campaign that was funding Fusion GPS, trying to influence the American electorate. It is upside down.

Yet the person who is tied throughout all of this is Robert Mueller. He is the guy conducting the investigation. Is there any clearer conflict of interest than what we see in this special investigator?

Again, with my colleagues—I thank all of them who have spoken tonight—I renew my call for his resignation, short of that, his termination of employment.

This is the scandal of our time. It affects our national security, the views of the American people for justice, and our elections.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

TAX POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I came here to talk about tax policy, and I will; however, having listened for the last 60 minutes to the most remarkable admission that Russia is meddling in America in many, many ways, even an admission that Russia somehow wants to influence America's elections—in this case, America's elections for the last year—I am pleased that my Republican colleagues are so adamant in pursuing Russian influence and, perhaps, controversial influence in the United States. I am pleased that they are doing that.

I am also pleased that Mr. Mueller is continuing his investigations. I will note that there have been two indictments and one guilty plea that have already come forth from his investigation having to do with people that are very, very close to President Trump's administration.

More will come of that, and I certainly hope our Republican friends will continue to focus on the fact that Russia is playing very serious and, quite possibly, illegal games or activities here in the United States.

We will carry on. I firmly believe that Mr. Mueller is not about to resign or be fired. If he were to be fired, I would suspect that there would be far more serious consequences than the kind of yapping we just heard for the last hour here on the floor.

Let me go back to my original point, which has to do with tax policy. As interesting as Russia might be, tax policy is going to be far, far more consequential in the long term. Whatever comes of the Russian situation in the election and conspiracies or other kinds of conflicts will bear themselves out over the next several years or months. Tax policy, however, is something that America is going to live with for a long, long time, were it to pass.

There are many things we could say about it. One is that, yes, the top 1 percent of America's wealthiest people—you take 360 million of us Americans and take the top 1 percent—are going to get 50 percent of all of the tax cuts that are in this multitrillion-dollar tax cut legislation.

So a trillion and a half dollars over the next 10 years to the top 1 percent ought to really drive up that problem that we call income disparity in the United States, you know, what we used to talk about: the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, or that America has a real problem with the superwealthy controlling most of the wealth and the rest of Americans really left behind.

So this tax bill is going to make it even worse. Now, that is really good. How does it do that?

Well, let's see. By eliminating the estate tax. Yes, five members of President Trump's Cabinet, including the President, would benefit in the billions. You see, the estate tax would be eliminated in just 4 years, about the same time they would be leaving the administration.

What does that mean?

Well, if you have a billion-dollar estate and there is a tax on that, you can eliminate the first $10 million, $11 million of that, but you have a 40 percent tax on the remainder. Well, that is about $400 million in estate tax.

Who would have a billion-dollar estate?

The President, Mr. Ross, the Treasury Secretary, maybe the Education Secretary, maybe others.

So who is going to benefit from this?

The superwealthy, to the tune of millions upon millions or hundreds of millions of dollars of the estate tax itself.

There is much more to that. American corporations would see their top rating from 39 down to 20. Who is going to benefit from that?

Well, we heard the Treasury Secretary say the American workers will.

Where is the evidence for that?

There is no evidence for that, none at all; in fact, quite the contrary. The Treasury Department's own tax analysis section says that 70 percent of the after-profit taxes now go to, guess who. Stockholders and executives, not to the workers.

It used to be that way back in the sixties and seventies. Maybe 70 percent went to the workers, went to increasing plants and equipment, investments in the United States. It is not that way anymore. Quite the contrary. The American workers will be left behind once again by those tax reductions.

That is not to say we shouldn't reduce the nominal tax rate for corporations. Yes, we should, but we should do it in a way that actually helps American workers. It keeps investments in the United States. But, no, not this tax proposal. This one actually creates what is called territorial accounting for international corporations.

Let's suppose that you have an international corporation located in Silicon Valley. We have some really big ones there. Territorial taxes would be that all of the earnings that that corporation has outside of the United States would be beyond being taxed by the United States, even though it is an American corporation that can manipulate the price of its goods and services to actually push, overseas, its profits. Brilliant.

You want to bring jobs back to America? Don't do territorial tax reform. It doesn't work for the American worker. It works for the stockholders. Their stocks and stock prices will go up. They will be able to receive even more benefits.

That is only $3 trillion over 10 years of reduction for corporation taxes.

Who benefits?

Wall Street corporate executives.

Who loses?

The American worker loses.

One more thing that is on my mind is that I used to hear last year, the year before last, the year before that—in fact, for the last two decades—a lot of talk from about more than half of the Members of this House of Representatives who would talk about the horrible impact of the American deficit and that it would lead to ruin for the American economy, our grandchildren would be left to pay it off, and all the horrible things that the deficit would bring to the United States, ultimately leading to the collapse of the American economy.

Well, there is some truth in that. The hyperbole was a little bit more than necessary, but, indeed, it is a problem to see our deficit ever increasing.

Every now and then, we come up against the debt limit, and, oh, my goodness, the debate that took place here: We have got to stop it. We have got to stop deficit financing. We have got to bring our budget back into balance.

Not a bad idea. In fact, it is the right thing to do. And, by the way, it was actually done during the Clinton administration.

For 2 years, almost 3 years, the American Federal Government ran a surplus, and it was estimated that in the 2000 to 2010 period, if that surplus were to continue, it might lead to a significant and troublesome reduction in the American debt. That is a complex question as to why that would be troublesome, but, nonetheless, it was said.

□ 2000

So what happened?

George W. Bush came in, cut taxes, decided we would go to war, first war ever in America's history that was not financed by taxes but by borrowing, mostly from China, and the deficit began to explode. And then there was the great collapse in 2008, and the deficit went right through the roof.

So we have been living, since that time of the George W. Bush tax cuts with a deficit, a structural deficit that has not been solved despite all the rhetoric from the deficit hawks.

Now, I guess the deficit hawks, like the Canadian geese, have somehow migrated to the far south of Washington, D.C., because I don't hear any around here today. They have migrated somewhere far away from Washington. But what I hear from those previous folks that called themselves deficit hawks is that they want to drive up the American deficit, that they have a proposal to actually increase the American deficit.

Oh, wonderful, they say, not to worry. We can increase the deficit by well over $1.5 trillion in the next decade and it will be lovely. We will create more jobs.

I am going: Excuse me. I must have missed something in this debate. You just said a year ago that those deficits would somehow create a calamity for the American economy, that we would lose jobs, we would lose our competitiveness, that we would come to ruin, and now you are telling me I shouldn't worry about a $1.5 trillion increase in the deficit over the next decade?

Wow, how does that work? How does that happen?

I want to share something with you. I became—trying to understand what this was all about, how could it be 6 months ago or a year ago they were deficit hawks and they had to do away with the deficit and now they want to increase the deficit? What is this all about?

So I asked my staff: Give me some numbers. Don't we have what we know as a structural deficit built into the budget of the United States tax revenues significantly lower than the expenditures, and therefore we have this structural deficit? Show me what those numbers are.

So they did, and here they are.

Structural deficit, 2018, the structural deficit is $567 billion. That is half a trillion. That is the structural deficit that exists today without any of this discussion about tax cuts.

Next year, 2019, it is expected to be $689 billion, two-thirds of $1 trillion in 1 year—in 1 year.

And it goes on.

The structural deficit in 2020, $775 billion. That is the ongoing structural deficit in the Federal budget: revenue received, expenditures—expenditures $775 billion more than the revenue in 2020.

This isn't talking about the new tax cuts that are being discussed now here in Congress.

And so it goes.

In 2022, it is $1 trillion annual structural deficit.

So what does this tax cut mean?

Oh, it is only $1.4 trillion or $1.5 trillion over a 10-year period, but that is on top of the existing structural deficit.

So here you have it. This year, the existing structural deficit before any tax cuts, we are talking about $563 billion. Added to that, as a result of the Republican Ryan-McConnell-Trump tax cuts, we are adding $114 billion on top of $563 billion so that the structural deficit, should this new tax cut ever come into place, will be $677 billion—not millions, billions.

Over the next 10 years, by the end of the 10-year period, as that tax cut, this new tax cut goes into effect, with the addition adding to the existing structural deficit, in the year 2027, 10 years from now, you can expect a $1.6 trillion structural deficit.

This is a problem. It is a problem that is made even worse—even worse—by the fact that the benefit of the tax cut does not go to economic growth, but quite the contrary. It does not go to the working men and women, the middle class of America who really do need to have a better way, better wages, more money in their pockets, a better living, a better ability to take care of their family and their children, a better education, a better opportunity, and a better infrastructure. No. No. None of that will happen. Instead, what will happen as a result of the Republican tax cut is that the wealthy will get wealthier.

Remember this: 50 percent of all of the tax cut benefits—and we are talking trillions here, as much as $3 trillion over a 10-year period. Fifty percent of that will go to the top 1 percent of Americans. We are talking the superwealthy here.

That is not a better way. That is an awful way to run a government. That is an awful thing for an economy when you continue to skew the American economy to the superwealthy and leave behind the American worker, the American family struggling to do better, struggling to have a better opportunity for their children in school, a better road or a better bus or a better train on which to travel, a better transportation system.

So here we are. Here we are in the House of Representatives debating in committee today how to make the deficit worse, how to increase the structural deficit over the next 10 years, how to literally run this country into bankruptcy.

No, we are not going to go bankrupt, but what we will do, we will terminate key programs as we struggle to find ways of balancing the budget with so little Federal revenue available to us as a result of these tax cuts. I could probably go on for an hour and just work myself into a rage about the lost opportunity.

We Democrats have proposed a better solution, a better way to deal with the tax policies, one that actually provides benefits to the working families of America, who, as our Republican friends like to say, sit around the kitchen table and worry about their debts. Yes, indeed, they do. They worry about it. We have a better way of providing for the infrastructure, a better way of providing for our national security, our education, and on and on.

The architect of those programs that lay out a better way for the American economy and the American worker and the American family is with us here tonight, our minority leader, Ms. PELOSI.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I accept his compliment on behalf of the House Democratic Caucus, which really developed the better deal. It sprang from our membership, with consensus based on our values that keep us united for America's working families. That is the unifying factor in our Democratic Caucus in the House.

Mr. GARAMENDI, I thank you for your diligence in always coming to the floor and speaking truth about the numbers, about what they mean to America's future, and also about making it in America. So much of that is violated by what the Republicans have put forth.

I thank you for starting with the budget, because a budget should be a statement of national values. What is important to us as a nation should be reflected in how we allocate our resources. That is how we Democrats have always thought of it and acted upon it.

That is not what is present in the Republican budget on which these taxes are predicated.

Would it be a statement of your values to take $1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid and give a $1.5 trillion tax cut to corporate America while, at the same time, saying to working families you are going to have to pay what little—hit them on their deduction on SALT, the State and local taxes, and rubbing salt in the wound by saying that corporations don't have that deduction taken away from them and, at the same time, in this tax plan, making it advantageous for corporations to send jobs overseas by having them pay a lower tax for a factory they set up abroad than they would pay in the United States?

It is just not right. It is just not fair.

You have been a champion, along with Mr. HOYER, on making it in America. Again, this tax proposal that the Republicans are putting forth does violence to all of that.

And thank you for pointing out the structural nature of what they are doing to the budget. The Republicans, our colleagues, are supposed to be deficit hawks. We agree that we must pay as you go. That has been our modus operandi until the Republicans came along and removed that: You want something? Pay as you go.

Republicans contend to be deficit hawks, but that must be an endangered species because none of them seem to recognize or acknowledge the damage they are doing to our fiscal soundness as we go out not just in the first 10 years, which is damaging enough and structurally horrible enough, but in the following 10 years. And we in Congress, when we make proposals that have a budget impact, have to account for not only the first 10 years, but the second 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, in the second 10 years, the horror of what the Republican tax bill does to the budget is a hemorrhaging—a hemorrhaging. This tax bill, when Members vote for it, if they do, will be an assault on our children's future. It is not only fiscally unsound, it is morally ungrounded because it says to our children and, in my case, our grandchildren: You are going to have to pay the bill.

The sad part of it is it has an impact on the budget. It comes back and says, well, we have so much deficit and so much debt service, so much interest on the national debt, we are now going to have to make further cuts in education, in research and development, in all of the initiatives that produce innovation.

Innovation begins in the classroom. They make an assault on the classroom in this tax bill. It is going to get worse when they try to pay for it.

Then, of course, it is fiscal engineering so that they can go after Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security once again. They have never really believed in Medicare. They say it should wither on the vine, and in this bill, they do violence to it.

But let's just talk about what this does to the State of California, my colleague, because our Golden State, which we are proud to represent, is a great economic resource to the Nation—to the Nation. It contributes enormously to our balance in trade, whether it is agriculture from your area, innovation, entertainment, whatever it is. California is a big producer of favorable balance of trade for America.

Without California and without the industries that it has spread throughout the country, we would be in an even worse trade situation than we are now for all the giveaways that the Republicans are giving in the trade issue.

But let me just talk about this and what it means to people in their homes at their kitchen table when they are trying to pay the bills, establish their own priorities, make ends meet.

It is shocking, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely shocking that 14 of our colleagues from California voted for a budget, and now many of them are proposing to vote for a tax bill, that will hurt their constituents to the tune of tens of thousands of their constituents.

DOUG LAMALFA, the First District of California, around 100,000 households in his district claim the SALT deduction to the tune of thousands of dollars, and they will lose that.

TOM MCCLINTOCK, around 100,000 or more claimed the deduction, and that is 36 percent of the households in his district, and they will lose thousands of dollars.

How does PAUL COOK explain to his constituents, 57,000 of them who have claimed the deduction, that he is going to cost them thousands of dollars by increasing their tax bill?

□ 2015

JEFF DENHAM, he is really going to have to explain it very hard to a large percentage of his constituents as to how he is increasing their tax bill by thousands of dollars.

DAVID VALADAO, tens of thousands of his constituents will get the bad news if he insists on voting for this bill, which will cost them thousands of dollars.

DEVIN NUNES, tens of thousands of his constituents will pay the price for his lack of courage in a vote to go down the line with the Republicans to give a tax break to the wealthiest corporate America at the expense of their constituents, a direct expense and cost to their constituents.

KEVIN MCCARTHY says to corporate America: We will give you $1.5 trillion tax cut, and guess who is paying for it? Around over 100,000 of my constituents to the tune of thousands of dollars.

STEVE KNIGHT: Don't worry, my constituents, we are giving the tax cut to corporate America, $1.5 trillion, and we are taking it out of your pocket, you are paying more.

Sadly, ED ROYCE has the largest number of people who will be affected, close to 100,000 people, and they will be spending thousands of dollars more in the taxes that they pay because of SALT.

KEN CALVERT, the same thing, tens of thousands paying thousands of dollars more.

MIMI WALTERS, how does she explain to her constituents, tens of thousands of them, that they will be paying thousands of dollars more in taxes? Why? To give a tax break to the top 2 percent: 80 percent of the tax break goes to the top 2 percent, 50 percent of it goes to the top 1 percent, $1.5 trillion goes to corporate America.

DANA ROHRABACHER, the same thing, tens of thousands of people will be paying thousands of dollars more.

DARRELL ISSA. Hopefully DARRELL won't vote for this. Hopefully some of these constituents will make sure that their Member of Congress knows that they see what is happening. DARRELL ISSA, well over 100,000 constituents paying thousands of dollars more.

DUNCAN HUNTER, the same thing, around the same number. Well over 100,000—well over 150,000 paying thousands of dollars more. That represents about a third of his district.

But, as I said before, to rub salt in the wounds, while they are saying to their constituents, "You are going to pay more because we are taking away your deduction," they are saying to corporate America, "Your deductions for State and local taxes you keep." It is just remarkable.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Leader, if I might, you said SALT. It is like really pouring salt on a wound. But SALT is State and local taxes.

So for California, New Jersey, New York, Illinois, and other States that have big populations, they collect this revenue, and it cannot be deducted. The numbers you have, I understand those came from the Department of the Treasury and the IRS.

Ms. PELOSI. And I underestimated them because I know they would question them, so I gave a conservative view. It is worse.

But you bring up the State and local, what SALT means, State and local taxes. The State and localities, did you see there is a letter—I don't have it right here—from the mayors of scores of cities in California asking the Members of Congress not to vote for this because of the provision that is in there that undermines their ability to address the education needs of their constituents, of the people in those towns and cities, the public safety issues? We had a firefighter come testify as to what it means to public safety, to law enforcement, to meeting the needs of people so that they can learn, that they can work, that they can raise their families, and to do so in a way that everyone pays his or her fair share. That is not the case here.

So, again, it is a boon to the megarich corporate special interest and a bust to the middle class. It also is very harmful to small business.

While the Republicans will say this is good for the middle class, it is not. They give with one hand something and take with another, so they can set the banquet table for the superrich corporate America and throw some crumbs to the middle class and say:

Sucker. I am just telling it the way it is.

Instead, Democrats say: Let's go to the table, let's be respectful of each other's views, let's have a clear objective debate on putting growth in the middle table—what creates growth for our economy, generating good-paying jobs, not stagnated wages, good-paying jobs, and reduces the deficit, instead of taking us into a hemorrhaging state of deficit in the years to come.

That is part of what is now. If time allows, and after the gentleman says his remarks, I will go into some of the specific ways in which cruelty is demonstrated in this budget. But right now, I just want to say this is a letter to the California delegation from 24 cities with their seals at the top and the signature of their mayors, some of them Republican, who have asked not to pass a bill that has this provision in it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Leader, you raised a very important point early on here about the way in which—I just heard you ask to reach out to Republicans to sit down and talk about how to structure a decent tax reform, not just a tax cut for the wealthy.

My understanding is the Republicans have not even offered a moment—a second—to discuss these tax bills with any of us, nor have they had even one hearing on the most consequential economic policy that this Nation could put forward. Not a hearing at all, but rushing out secretly. Today, I understand they had a markup, but no witnesses, other than someone to answer questions as to the impact.

And there has been discussion about the past major tax cut of Ronald Reagan's in 1986, in which we heard that there were 2 years of hearings all around the Nation and, I guess, more than 30 hearings in Congress before that major tax bill passed in 1986. But now here we are rushing this huge monumental and very detrimental tax bill through.

Now, that is what I have heard, and I am not in the leadership, but, as far as I know, they haven't talked to you.

Ms. PELOSI. No. Well, what you see is they haven't really talked to the American people because they don't want the American people to know what is in this bill.

You would think that at the time when the bill is being marked up in committee, when they came to the floor instead of engaging in their conspiracy theories, they would, instead, brag about what they are doing if they think it is right, but they are not. And the reason is they are going so fast. This is the speed of light, in the dark of night, so that nobody knows until it is too late, but we are going to make sure that everyone does.

Let me correct my statement. I am not sure if any of the Republican mayors signed this letter, but 24 mayors did. I see two prominent mayors lacking on here, and I guess the discipline of the Republican Party is extended to the mayors. But their cities will suffer, and they know it.

Just another point, because you brought up process. I am not into process. This is about what does this mean to America's families. But because you brought it up, it is important to know that they don't want people to know, and that is why their process is so behind closed doors. Their members didn't even know what was in this until a couple of days ago.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You said it. I was astounded that, during the first Special Order hour, there were about 12 members of the Republican Party who came down here on some weird conspiracy theory, and I am going: Wait a minute, guys, why don't you talk about your tax bill; why don't you sit up here and brag about all of the good things you are doing on the tax bill?

Apparently they want to hide.

Ms. PELOSI. Every single one of them is voting to raise the taxes of their constituents.

And in California—not that they were from California—but the nonpartisan Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy estimates that 5.5 million California taxpayers—that is about a third of our taxpayers, and that is families, so that is many people—will see an average tax increase of $4,180; 2.2 million of those receiving a tax increase will have incomes of less than $110,000.

Mr. GARAMENDI. That is middle-income.

Ms. PELOSI. So how can they say to the middle class, this is for you?

Mr. GARAMENDI. You were laying out, Madam Leader, our Republican colleagues from California who seem to ignore or want to not even think about the State and local tax deduction, and also the mortgage interest deduction. Trying to find a house in California that is for less than $500,000 or $700,000 is virtually impossible. Certainly in the bay area, much of southern California, and in the Sacramento region, it is almost impossible.

So by reducing that mortgage interest deduction, together with State and local taxes, you are seriously increasing the tax burden on homeowners and on working men and women in California.

You laid it out so very well. In the district directly to my south—Mr. DENHAM's district—101,000 of his constituents currently have a $7,982 average deduction for State and local taxes, and for the mortgage interest. They will lose that, and they will wind up paying somewhere between 25 to 30 percent on that lost deduction. So let's say 25 percent of $8,000 is what, $2,000? New taxes right there.

Ms. PELOSI. New taxes.

And we all want to encourage homeownership because it is putting down roots. Building community is very important. But it is not just California, it is across the country.

We are speaking from our experience. We are holding the California Republicans accountable. But every one of the Members who votes here is doing an injustice to the ability of States and local governments to do their job. We are cutting taxes. Now you go raise them so you can get the job done. So it makes matters even worse when you see what else is there.

Some of the cruelties that are in the bill, I mean, macrowise we know that this is a big transfer of wealth from middle class people to corporate America and to the superrich. We know that it is unfair to the middle class and will raise taxes on the middle class. It will increase the deficit. It is a legacy assault on our children's future. In addition, it deprives us opportunity cost to our budget in the near-term.

But there are some things in here that maybe are illustrative of the fact that this is not a statement of anybody's values that you know.

Let's talk about education for a moment. First of all, with all due respect, Mr. Speaker, one of the dumbest moves in this bill, with stiff competition, but one of the dumbest moves in this bill is the cut to education. Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than investing in education: early childhood, K–12, higher education, postgrad, lifetime learning. And in this bill, they, of course, make an assault on education.

For example, if you have a student loan, right now you have a $2,500 deduction for your interest payment on the loan. Not in this bill. Make that zero.

What? What did the middle class ever do to the Republicans that they are going to take away a deduction for interest on student loans when it is hard enough to save up and pay for college?

Next, now let's just go down to grade school. You are a teacher and you bring to school supplies for the classroom because your district is too poor to afford all of the things that the children would like to have. Right now, you get a tax deduction for what you bring to the classroom, but not in this bill. They have to take that away so they can give a tax break to the superrich so that schoolteacher isn't even compensated adequately, is sacrificing her personal funds, gets a tax break, but they take it away because the top 2 percent are desperate for their tax cut. But I don't think they are. I have more faith in the people of our country to say: Let us pay our fair share and let's do what is right.

But the list goes on on the things about lifetime learning and employers being able to provide for the training of workers: bye-bye.

Let me just tell you this one, since we are talking about education and children. In the bill, right now you get a tax credit to help you with adopting a child.

□ 2030

Such a joy to a family. If you are adopting a child with special needs, a tax credit. Not now. They have got to take that tax credit away from you. You don't need it anymore because they have got to give it to corporate America.

If your employer decides that their place of business wants to help you with adoption, they get a deduction for helping you with your adoption. Not under this bill. Say good-bye to that.

Tax credit to the family adopting, tax deduction to the employer all gone so they can give the top 1 percent of our country 50 percent of this benefit at the cost of America's working families.

If you have medical needs, since 1944, you could deduct medical expenses for extraordinary medical needs. Very important to America's families. Not anymore. Say good-bye to that because we have got to take care of the superrich, so the pressure is on you.

The list goes on and on, but it gets personal. For families, it makes a difference as to whether their children can go to college. It makes a difference as to whether they can make ends meet with their medical expenses. It makes a difference if they don't have their State and local tax deduction. Again, this is across the country. We are speaking from our California experience.

It would take all night to go through the sins in this tax bill. I just wanted to give you a touch of some of those and how they directly impact America's working families while they profess that they are helping them. Not true.

Then they say: Oh, it is going to pay for itself.

Never has, never has. Don't take it from us. Bruce Bartlett, who is part of this supply side economics leadership as well as the trickle-down economics, said: We never said it would pay for itself. Anybody who says it does, it is not true. It is nonsense.

He even went on to say it was BS, as I am allowed to say on the floor of the House in its initial form.

These other things they say that just aren't true—oh, they take the name of Bill Bradley and Dick Gephardt in vain, and even President Ronald Reagan: Oh, this is what they did.

No, this isn't what they did. They had over 400 people to testify, 30 hearings over a period of a couple of years, and worked in a bipartisan way to iron out so that it would have sustainability. That is the only way you get a good tax bill, is if it is bipartisan and sustainable.

So, in any event, this is a moment of truth for the American people, and we want the truth to be known.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for calling the Special Order.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Madam Leader for joining us tonight.

I remember here on the floor, when the debate occurred over the budget that did pass the House of Representatives a couple of weeks ago, you spoke eloquently on the floor about what this budget would mean, that it would open the door to some very bad public policies, in fact, public policies that would harm individual Americans as well as the American economy, and you were very passionate about it. You said that about the budget, which passed the House only on Republican votes, no Democrat votes.

Ms. PELOSI. And just barely. Just barely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Yes. JEFF DENHAM, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and the other Republicans from California included.

Ms. PELOSI. All 14 California Republicans, like lemmings to the sea, betraying the economic security of their constituents' families.

Mr. GARAMENDI. You laid it out. You made it very, very clear that it would lead to a tax bill that would be harmful. We had some ideas then what it would be, but we had no idea that it would be such a horrendous problem for the American economy and particularly for the American workers and middle class. You laid that out very well.

You also laid out very, very clearly that in that budget was the blueprint for the evisceration of programs that Americans depend upon. You talked about Medicare and you talked about Medicaid, of which 60 percent of Medicaid goes to seniors in nursing homes across this Nation, and the potential cut that would come to Medicare.

You also talked about how it would, as you just did, go after the education system, after research that we need for medical research, and economics, and all of the sciences. You talked about the infrastructure.

You laid out that that budget bill was the template. We are now seeing that template come to reality on the floor of the House first with this tax cut. Probably within months, should this tax bill pass, we are going to see the rest of what you told us to watch out for. Watch out for the cuts coming to Medicare, watch out for the cuts coming to Medicaid, to education, to infrastructure, to the things that Americans depend upon in their daily lives, the Meals on Wheels program, and then the supplemental nutrition programs.

Standing right here, I remember I was in the back of the room here, and I heard you speak about what would happen if that budget bill passed the House. It did. Now we are seeing the first step. There will be another step. They will come back after the Affordable Care Act and medical care and all of that. I wish you were wrong.

Ms. PELOSI. I do, too.

Mr. GARAMENDI. What you did standing here warning us, I wish you were wrong, but you are not. You are absolutely correct. Now we are seeing it play out here in secret without public hearings.

We are going to talk about this, and I hope the American people will hold those accountable who vote for such a horrendous economic policy, one that actually creates a structural deficit that will be virtually impossible for America to get out of, and all of the harm that will come by shifting enormous wealth to the men and women who already are the wealthiest ever in the last 400 years. The wealthy in America have accumulated more wealth in a smaller group than at any time in the last 4 centuries dating back to the Spanish Crown in 1500 and 1600. That is bad economics, bad social policy. That is what they are doing.

Thank you so very much for joining us tonight.

Ms. PELOSI. It was my pleasure.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We are going to drive this and make sure the American public knows what is coming down.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank you, because one thing that we must make sure they know is that this is not tax reform. It is not a tax cut unless you are in the top 2 percent or a corporation. But if you are a middle class American or a working family in our country, you are susceptible to an increase in what you pay in taxes. It is just not fair.

I thank Mr. GARAMENDI for his relentless leadership.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, Madam Leader.

As I close, I will just say that this is not the last of this debate. We are going to make sure that the American public knows what is happening to them and what this Republican Congress is doing to the American public.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 8, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3114. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-069, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3115. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 17-038, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.